

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
MARTINSBURG**

ROBIN M. ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:22-CV-49
(GROH)**

**UNKNOWN NAMED SPECIAL AGENT,
MICHAEL NORDWAL, US DEPARTMENT
OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, DENNIS
MCDONOUGH, KENNETH
ALLENSWORTH, THOMAS MICHAEL,
BRITTANY STRITE, BERKELEY COUNTY
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, CURTIS
KELLER, WILLIE JOHNSON, AJ WEIDMAN,
RYAN KOLB, CITY HOSPITAL, INC.,
WVU MEDICINE: BERKELEY MEDICAL
CENTER, RYAN LIVENGOD, GWEN
HENRY, DR. RAJA MOGALLAPU, VALLEY
HEALTH SYSTEMS INC. VALLEY HEALTH
INTERNAL MEDICINE, JEAN BRIDWELL,
EASTRIDGE MENTAL HEALTH CENTER
INC., DR. JAFAR ALMASHAT, MD., DR.
ABDUL HAMEED, and DR. FEZAN RIZVI,**

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Now before the Court is a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") issued by United States Magistrate Judge Robert W. Trumble. ECF No. 10. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Trumble for a preliminary review to determine whether the Plaintiff's Complaint set forth any viable claims. ECF No. 4. On May 9, 2022, Magistrate Judge Trumble issued his R&R, recommending that the Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis [ECF

No. 2] be denied and her complaint be dismissed without prejudice. ECF No. 10.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to conduct a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, this Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file objections in a timely manner constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and a plaintiff's right to appeal this Court's order. 28.U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Moreover, "[w]hen a party does make objections, but these objections are so general or conclusory that they fail to direct the district court to any specific error by the magistrate judge, *de novo* review is unnecessary." Green v. Rubenstein, 644 F. Supp. 2d 723, 730 (S.D. W. Va. 2009) (citing Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)).


Objections to Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R were due within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the same. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The R&R was mailed to the Plaintiff by certified mail, return receipt requested, and service was accepted on May 12, 2022. ECF No. 11. To date, the Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R&R. Thus, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

In his R&R, Magistrate Judge Trumble found that the Court lacks jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims, she has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and has presented frivolous claims. Upon careful review, and finding no error of fact or law, the Court **ORDERS** that Magistrate Judge Trumble's Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 10] is **ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated therein.

The Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is **DENIED** [ECF No. 2] and her Complaint [ECF No. 1] is **DISMISSED**. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **STRIKE** this case from the Court's active docket.

The Clerk is further **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to the *pro se* Plaintiff by certified mail, return receipt requested, at her last known address as reflected on the docket sheet.

DATED: June 9, 2022


GINA M. GROH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE